

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 403

JC 860 527

AUTHOR Smith, Milton L.
TITLE Part-Time Faculty in Private Junior Colleges:
1985-86.
INSTITUTION Southwest Texas State Univ., San Marcos. Dept. of
Educational Administration and Psychological
Services.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 15p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Church Related Colleges; *College Faculty;
Educational Trends; *Employment Patterns; National
Surveys; *Part Time Faculty; Personnel Policy;
*Private Colleges; *Teacher Characteristics; Teaching
Load; *Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In spring 1986, a national study was conducted to assess the status of part-time faculty in private two-year colleges. Questionnaires were mailed to 142 institutions in 37 states, including 68 independent non-profit colleges, 64 church-related colleges, and 10 independent for-profit colleges. Study findings, based on an overall usable response rate of 60%, included the following: (1) 98.82% of the 85 responding colleges employed part-time faculty; (2) the independent for-profit colleges employed the highest percentage of part-time faculty (76%), while the church-related colleges employed the lowest percentage (38%); (3) 35% of the colleges reported an increase in the number of part-time faculty employed, 16% reported a decrease, and 49% indicated that the number had remained the same as the previous year; (4) 47% of the colleges reported that one course per semester or quarter was the average teaching load of part-time faculty; (5) 40% reported that part-time faculty were paid more than \$1000 per course taught; (6) 72% provided some office space for most part-time faculty; (7) 62% indicated that part-time faculty were not required to hold office hours; (8) in only 5 of the 84 colleges responding to this item did part-time faculty receive the same fringe benefits as full-time faculty; (9) most institutions indicated that their part-time faculty had the same amount of formal education and teaching experience as their full-time faculty; (10) 74% of the colleges reported that a majority of their part-time faculty were employed elsewhere, either full- or part-time; and (11) the reason given most frequently for employing part-time faculty was to accommodate enrollments which did not justify full-time faculty. (EJV)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

PART-TIME FACULTY IN PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES: 1985-86

ED274403

by

Milton L. Smith, Ph.D.
Professor and Director, Junior College Education

Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas

November, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. L. SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

JC 860527

PART-TIME FACULTY IN PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES: 1985-86

During the 1980-81 academic year, a study of the status of part-time faculty in private two-year colleges in the nation was conducted. The results of that study are included in the ERIC Database.¹ Recent requests from community college staff members combined with the desire to have current information on the status of two-year college faculty prompted the writer to replicate the study at the mid-point in the decade of the 1980s. This report contains the findings of that second study.

The Study

During the spring semester of 1986, a survey instrument was mailed to each of the private, two-year institutions listed in the 1985 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Instruments were mailed to 142 institutions in 37 states. Sixty-eight institutions were independent, non-profit colleges; 64 were church-related colleges; and 10 were independent, profit colleges.

The survey instrument was sent to the president of each institution requesting that either the president or an appropriate member of the administrative staff respond to 18 items designed to secure data relative

¹Milton L. Smith. Part-Time Faculty in Private Junior Colleges (Alexandria, VA.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED211 141, 1981).

to the status of part-time faculty in the respondent's institution during the 1985-86 academic year. Table 1 shows a summary of the number and percentage of instruments returned.

Table 1
Return Rate of Instruments Mailed

No. Mailed	No. Returned	Per Cent Returned	No. Usable Returns	Per Cent Usable Returns
142	88	61.97%	85	59.85%

Forty-six of the 64 church-related colleges returned usable instruments (71% return); 33 of the 68 independent, non-profit institutions returned usable instruments (48% return); and 6 of the 10 independent, profit institutions returned usable instruments (60% return). Such a high rate of return supports a generalization of the findings to the total population of 142 private, two-year colleges in the United States.

The Results of the Study

Data in response to 18 items were requested. The findings are reported for each item in two ways: (1) by totals for all responding institutions, and (2) by sub-totals for each category of private institution, *i.e.*, church-related (C.R.); independent, non-profit (Ind.N.P.); and independent, profit (Ind.Pr.).

Item 1. During this academic year (1985-86) are there any part-time faculty employed in your institution? Of the 85 responding institutions, 84 (98.82%) employed part-time faculty. Table 2 shows complete data.

Table 2
Institutions Employing Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Type of College	No. Responding Affirmatively	No. Responding Negatively	Total
C.R.	45	1	46
Ind.N.P.	33	0	33
Ind.Pr.	6	0	6
Total	84	1	85

Item 2. How many part-time faculty (head count) are employed? What is the total head count of all faculty — both full and part-time? There were 84 institutions which responded to this item. The data are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Part-Time Faculty vs. Full-Time Faculty
1985-86

Type of College	Most Part-Time Faculty	Fewest Part-Time Faculty	Average Part-Time Faculty	Most Full-Time Faculty	Fewest Full-Time Faculty	Average Full-Time Faculty
C.R. (N=45)	185	1	18	274	4	32
Ind.N.P. (N=33)	193	1	41	68	3	30
Ind.Pr. (N=6)	168	2	47	36	7	15
Total (N=84)	193	1	29	274	3	30

	Largest PerCent Part-Time Faculty	Smallest PerCent Part-Time Faculty	Average PerCent Part-Time Faculty
C.R. (N=45)	84%	3%	38%
Ind.N.P. (N=33)	96%	15%	59%
Ind.Pr. (N=6)	82%	14%	76%
Total (N=84)	96%	3%	50%

Item 3. Is the number of part-time faculty presently employed an increase, decrease, or the same as last year (1984-85)? There were 82 institutions from which responses to this item were secured. Of that number, 35% indicated an increase, 16% indicated a decrease, and 49% indicated that the number was about the same as the previous year. Complete data are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Relationship of Part-Time Faculty in 1985 to Previous Year

Type of College	No. Responding	No. & PerCent Showing Increase	No. & PerCent Showing Decrease	No. & PerCent Showing Same
C.R.	44	14 (32%)	10 (23%)	20 (45%)
Ind.N.P.	32	11 (35%)	3 (9%)	18 (56%)
Ind.Pr.	6	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)
Total	82	29 (35%)	13 (16%)	40 (49%)

Item 4. In which subject area(s) do you employ the most part-time faculty? There were responses from 79 institutions to this item. The discipline in which most part-time faculty were employed was business. Among church-related institutions, the most frequent response was business, followed by mathematics, English, science, music, and social sciences. Among independent, non-profit institutions, the order of frequency was business, humanities, English, and technical areas. Each of the six responding independent, profit institutions indicated a different discipline as the one in which most part-time faculty were employed.

Item 5. What is the average teaching load of part-time faculty? Of the 83 institutions responding to this item, 39 indicated that one course per semester or quarter was the average load; 39 indicated that two courses per semester or quarter was the average load; two reported that three courses per semester or quarter was the average load; and three institutions reported an average load of four courses per semester or quarter.

Among church-related institutions, 56% reported one course as an average load, 40% reported two courses as an average load, 2% reported three courses as an average load, and 2% reported four courses as an average load. Among independent, non-profit institutions, an average load of one course was reported by 44% of the institutions, an average load of two courses by 53%, and an average load of three courses by 3%. Among independent, profit institutions, 67% reported two courses and 33% reported four courses as average loads.

Item 6. What is the average salary per course paid to part-time faculty? There were 84 institutions which responded to this item. Table 5 shows the resulting data.

Table 5

Average Salary Paid to Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Amount Paid Per Course	C.R. Colleges		Ind.N.P. Colleges		Ind.Pr. Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Less than \$500	2	4%	4	12%	2	33%	8	10%
\$500-\$750	9	20%	3	9%	1	17%	13	15%
\$750-\$1000	17	38%	11	33%	1	17%	29	35%
Above \$1000	17	38%	15	46%	2	33%	34	40%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	6	100%	84	100%

Item 7. Are part-time faculty provided with offices on campus? Of the 84 institutions responding to this item, 23 of them (28%) indicated that offices were not provided to part-time faculty. There were 61 institutions (72%) reporting that offices were provided for either some or all of the part-time faculty; 28 institutions (33%) provided offices for all part-time faculty, and 33 institutions (39%) provided offices for some part-time faculty. Data by type of institution are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Provision of Offices for Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Provision of Office	C.R. Colleges		Ind.N.P. Colleges		Ind.Pr. Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
No Provision	10	22%	8	24%	5	83%	23	28%
Yes, for some	21	47%	12	36%	0	0%	33	39%
Yes, for all	14	31%	13	40%	1	17%	28	33%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	6	100%	84	100%

Item 8. Are part-time faculty required to be on campus for student advisement and consultation a specified number of hours per week in addition to the time in class? There were 84 institutions responding to this item, of which 52 (62%) indicated no required hours for student advisement. Among the 32 institutions (38%) requiring student advisement hours, there was no uniformity as to amount required. Responses ranged from "unspecified"

to "determined by chairman" to specified amounts ranging from one hour to five hours. Data by type of private institution are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Required Student Advisement Hours
by Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Hours Required	C.R.Colleges		Ind.N.P.Colleges		Ind.Pr.Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
No	27	60%	22	67%	3	50%	52	62%
Yes	18	40%	11	33%	3	50%	32	38%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	6	100%	84	100%

Item 9. What does the college expect of part-time faculty with regard to faculty meetings? Only 14% of the 84 responding institutions required part-time faculty to attend faculty meetings. One college reported that part-time faculty were prohibited from attending faculty meetings. Table 8 details the data on this item.

Table 8

Attendance at Faculty Meetings by Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Attendance at Faculty Meeting	C.R.Colleges		Ind.N.P.Colleges		Ind.Pr.Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Required to Attend	7	16%	1	3%	4	66%	12	14%
Allowed to Attend	20	44%	17	52%	1	17%	38	45%
Not Required to Attend	18	40%	14	42%	1	17%	33	40%
Not Allowed to Attend	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	6	100%	84	100%

Item 10. What does the college expect of part-time faculty with regard to service on faculty committees? There were 83 institutions which responded to this item, only one of which required committee service of part-time faculty. Four institutions prohibited such service. Complete data on this item are shown in Table 9.

Table 9
Committee Service by Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Committee Service Status	C.R. Colleges		Ind.N.P. Colleges		Ind.Pr. Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Required to Serve	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
Allowed to Serve	15	33%	17	52%	4	80%	36	43%
Not Required to Serve	26	58%	15	45%	1	20%	42	51%
Not Allowed to Serve	3	7%	1	3%	0	0%	4	5%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	5	100%	83	100%

Item 11. Do part-time faculty receive the same fringe benefits as full-time faculty? In only 5 of the 84 institutions which responded to this item did part-time faculty receive the same fringe benefits as full-time faculty. Of the remaining 79 institutions responding negatively to this item, 6 (100%) were independent, profit institutions; 32 (97%) were independent, non-profit institutions, and 41 (91%) were church-related institutions.

The major differences in fringe benefits between full-time and part-time faculty were no insurance and no retirement benefits. Less frequently mentioned differences were no sick leave, half the sick leave, less faculty development support, and no residence provided.

Item 12. What does the college expect of part-time faculty with regard to orientation/in-service programs offered by the institution?

No institution prohibited part-time faculty from attending such programs. All of them either required attendance or encouraged it. Complete data on this item are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Part-Time Faculty Attendance at Orientation/Inservice
1985-86

Attendance Status	C.R.Colleges		Ind.N.P.Colleges		Ind.Pr.Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Required to Attend	14	31%	15	47%	3	50%	32	39%
Allowed to Attend	17	38%	11	34%	2	33%	30	36%
Not Required to Attend	14	31%	6	19%	1	17%	21	25%
Not Allowed to Attend	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	45	100%	32	100%	6	100%	83	100%

Item 13. Do your part-time faculty, on the average, have less, more, or equal formal education than your full-time faculty? Eighty-six per cent of the 84 responding institutions indicated that part-time faculty had an equal amount of formal education to that of the full-time faculty.

Complete data relating to this item are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Formal Education of Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Status of Formal Education	C.R.Colleges		Ind.N.P.Colleges		Ind.Pr.Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Less than Full-time Faculty	6	13%	0	0%	1	17%	7	8%
More than Full-time Faculty	2	5%	2	6%	1	17%	5	6%
Equal to Full-time Faculty	37	82%	31	94%	4	66%	72	86%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	6	100%	84	100%

Item 14. Do your part-time faculty, on the average, have less, more, or equal teaching experience when compared to your full-time faculty? Only two institutions -- both church related colleges -- reported that part-time faculty had more teaching experience than full-time faculty. Most institutions reported that the experience was equal; however, 44 per cent reported less teaching experience for part-time faculty. Table 12 shows complete data on this item.

Table 12

Teaching Experience of Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Status of Teaching Experience	C.R.Colleges		Ind.N.P.Colleges		Ind.Pr.Colleges		Total Coll.	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Less than Full-Time Faculty	17	38%	17	52%	3	50%	37	44%
More than Full-Time Faculty	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%
Equal to Full-Time Faculty	26	58%	16	48%	3	50%	45	54%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	6	100%	84	100%

Item 15. Are your part-time faculty evaluated on the same bases as are your full-time faculty? Eighty-two per cent of the 84 responding institutions reported the fact that part-time faculty were evaluated on the same bases as were the full-time faculty. Some differences reported by the 18% of institutions not using the same bases included: (1) no formal evaluation at all for part-time faculty; (2) less formal evaluation of part-time faculty; (3) work experience substituted for formal education for part-time faculty; (4) part-time faculty evaluated only on teaching performance with no requirement for student advisement, committee work, or other service; and (5) part-time faculty are evaluated by personal interviews with an administrator. Data secured on this item are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Evaluation of Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Same Bases as for Full-Time Faculty	C.R.Colleges		Ind.N.P.Colleges		Ind.Pr.Colleges		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Yes	36	80%	28	85%	5	83%	69	82%
No	9	20%	5	15%	1	17%	15	18%
Total	45	100%	33	100%	6	100%	84	100%

Item 16. What estimated percentage of your part-time faculty are employed: full-time elsewhere; part-time elsewhere; not employed elsewhere?

Sixty of the 81 institutions (74%) reported that a majority of their part-time faculty were employed elsewhere, either full-time or part-time. Twelve institutions reported that 100% of their part-time faculty were employed full-time elsewhere, and six institutions reported that 100% of their part-time faculty were employed part-time elsewhere. Only 10 institutions (12%) reported that a majority of their part-time faculty were not employed elsewhere. Complete data on this item are reported in Table 14.

Table 14

Employment Status of Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Employment Status of Part-Time Faculty	C.R. Colleges		Ind.N.P. Coll.		Ind.Pr. Coll.		Total Colleges	
	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent	No.	PerCent
Majority % employed full-time elsewhere	22	49%	18	60%	5	83%	45	56%
Majority % employed part-time elsewhere	8	18%	6	20%	1	17%	15	18%
Majority % employed nowhere else	8	18%	2	7%	0	0%	10	12%
No majority % among the three options	7	15%	4	13%	0	0%	11	14%
Total	45	100%	30	100%	6	100%	81	100%

Item 17. Rank the following reasons for the employment of part-time faculty in your institution, plus other reasons which you may include, by placing a number 1 for highest rank, 2 for second highest rank, 3 for third highest rank, etc. There were 84 institutions which responded to this item. The reason most frequently ranked as number 1 was "to accommodate enrollments which do not justify full-time faculty." Other less frequently ranked reasons are contained in Table 15.

Table 15

Reasons for Employment of Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Item	No. C. R. Colleges Ranking Item #1	No. Ind. N. P. Coll. Ranking Item #1	No. Ind. Pr. Coll. Ranking Item #1	Total Col Ranking #1
To accommodate enrollments which do not justify full- time faculty	24	13	2	39 (46%)
To acquire competent persons in fields where full-time faculty are not available	10	6	3	19 (23%)
To meet off-campus and even- ing class needs	7	7	0	14 (17%)
To achieve curricular flexibility	2	4	0	6 (7%)
To effect financial savings	2	2	0	4 (5%)
To have faculty who are kept up-to-date by their daily work	0	1	1	2 (2%)
Total	45	33	6	84 (100%)

Item 18. Rank the following sources from which you employed part-time faculty. plus other sources which you may include, by placing a number 1 for the source from which you employ the most, 2 for the source from which you employ second most, etc. There were 78 institutions which responded to this item. Forty-one per cent of the institutions listed business/industry employees as the number 1 source for part-time faculty. The frequency of the rankings of other sources is shown in Table 16.

Table 16

Sources for Part-Time Faculty
1985-86

Source	No. C. R. Coll. Ranking Source #1	No. Ind. N. P. Coll. Ranking Source #1	No. Ind. Pr. Coll. Ranking Source #1	Total Coll. Ranking #1
Business/Industry Employees	8	19	6	32 (41%)
Qualified Community Members not other- wise employed	9	2	0	11 (14%)
High School Faculty	6	2	0	8 (10%)
Faculty from 4-Yr. College/Univ.	3	5	0	8 (10%)

Spouse of Faculty Members	7	0	0	7 (9%)
Other 2-Year College Faculty	2	3	0	5 (7%)
Retired Community Member	3	0	0	3 (4%)
Administrator in Junior College	2	0	0	2 (3%)
University Student	1	0	0	1 (1%)
Dominican Fathers	1	0	0	1 (1%)
Total	42	31	5	78 (100%)

Summary

The data included in this report of a study of private, two-year colleges in the nation were obtained from survey instruments returned by 85 of the 142 colleges listed in the 1985 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Major findings of the study include: (1) 98.82% of responding colleges employed part-time faculty; (2) on the average, 50% of total faculty in colleges responding were part-time members although percentages ranged among institutions from 96% to 3% part-time; (3) 49% of the responding colleges reported the employment of about the same number of part-time faculty as in the previous year, 35% reported an increase from the previous year and 16% reported a decrease from the previous year; (4) business was the discipline most frequently listed as the subject in which part-time faculty are employed; (5) 47% of the responding institutions reported that one course per semester or quarter was an average load for part-time faculty, 47% reported two courses, 2% reported three courses, and 4% reported four courses; (6) 40% of the responding institutions reported salaries above \$1000 per course taught by part-time faculty, 35% reported salaries of \$750-\$1000 per course, 15% reported salaries of \$500-\$750 per course, and 10% reported salaries

of less than \$500 per course; (7) 72% of all responding colleges provided some office space for most part-time faculty while 28% provided no office space at all; (8) 62% of the responding institutions indicated that no hours on campus for student advisement were required of part-time faculty; (9) only 14% of the responding institutions required part-time faculty to attend faculty meetings; (10) service on faculty committees was required of part-time faculty in only 1% of the responding institutions and was prohibited in 5% of them; (11) part-time faculty received the same fringe benefits as full-time faculty in only 6% of the responding institutions; (12) attendance at orientation/in-service programs was required of part-time faculty in 39% of the responding institutions; (13) the formal education of part-time faculty was considered by responding institutions to be essentially equal to that of full-time faculty; (14) teaching experience of part-time faculty was reported by 54% of the responding institutions as equal to that of full-time faculty while in 44% of the institutions it was reported as less than that of full-time faculty; (15) 82% of the responding institutions reported that part-time and full-time faculty were evaluated on the same bases; (16) 56% of the responding institutions reported that a majority of their part-time faculty were employed full-time elsewhere; (17) to accommodate enrollments which do not justify full-time faculty was the reason most frequently ranked first for employing part-time faculty; and (18) more part-time faculty were employed from local businesses and industries than from any other single source.